R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 010 955 JC 660 284

STATE-WIDE PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

BY- BRUMBAUGH, AARON J.
SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD, ATLANTA, GA.

PUB DATE 63

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.32 58P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *MASTER PLANS, EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION, EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, *EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, *STATE PROGRAMS, *PLANNING COMMISSIONS, ATLANTA

THE AUTHOR BELIEVES THAT STATEWIDE PERSPECTIVE FOR THE TOTAL SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION REQUIRES AN INDEPENDENT STATE AGENCY AND SUGGESTS SEVERAL APPROACHES TO LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION WITH REFERENCE TO THE SOUTHERN STATES. THREE GENERAL TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS ARE INCLUDED (1) SINGLE COORDINATING-GOVERNING BOARDS, (2) LIAISON COORDINATING BOARDS, INTERMEDIARIES BETWEEN HIGHER INSTITUTIONS HAVING THEIR OWN BOARDS AND THE STATE LEGISLATURE AND ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES, AND (3) VOLUNTARY COORDINATION WITH NO EXTERNAL AGENCY CONTROL. EIGHT GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR A STATE PLANNING AND COORDINATION AGENCY ARE SUMMARIZED (1) A CLEAR CONCEPT OF THE LONG-RANGE MEANING OF PLANNING AND COORDINATION, (2) DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN PLANNING OF POLICY-MAKING AND INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT WHICH SHOULD NOT BE A STATE BOARD FUNCTION, (3) DIVESTMENT OF PARTISAN POLITICS, (4) CONSISTENCY AND CONTINUITY IN PURPOSES, POLICIES, AND FUNCTIONS, (5) EFFECTIVE LIAISON WITH INSTITUTIONS, THE LEGISLATURE, AND THE PUBLIC, (6) DETERMINATION OF CRITERIA FOR NEW PROGRAMS AND INSTITUTIONS, (7) COMPETENT STAFF WITH AN EXECUTIVE OFFICER HAVING SALARY AND STATUS COMPARABLE TO A UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT, AND (8) ADEQUATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT. SALARIES OF STATEWIDE ADMINISTRATIVE OR COORDINATING AGENCY STAFFS IN THE SOUTH ARE TABULATED AND A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF 25 GENERAL REFERENCES AND NINE STATE COUNCIL OR BOARD OF REPORTS IS INCLUDED. (DE)

ED010955

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 28 1966

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 660 284

STATE-WIDE PLANNING AND COORDINATION

By Al. J. Brumbaugh

1963

STATE-WIDE PLANNING AND COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by A. J. BRUMBAUGH,
Consultant

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD
130 Sixth Street, N. W. • Atlanta 13, Georgia

JC 660 284

FOREWORD

The enterprise of higher education has grown tremendously in recent years and it is apparent that the rate of growth will accelerate in the future. The number of students enrolled in existing institutions is increasing rapidly and in many states new institutions are being established. The functions which colleges and universities are called upon to perform also are increasing. These developments simply make more urgent the need which already existed for effective long-range planning in each of the states.

Various states have tried a variety of approaches to the problem of long-range planning and coordination of higher education. A. J. Brumbaugh has been a long-time observer of these developments. SREB asked Dr. Brumbaugh to study these arrangements with particular reference to the Southern states and to prepare a reasonably short, non-technical summary of them including the generalizations which can be made about requirements for effective state-wide planning and coordination based on the experience of existing agencies. His views will be of special interest to those public officials and educational leaders with most direct responsibility for developing programs of public higher education to accommodate the bulk of future enrollments.

Winfred L. Godwin
Director
Southern Regional Education Board

June 5, 1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword iii

Summary of Requirements for Effective State Planning vi

Why Planning and Coordination Are Important 1

What Is Involved In Planning and Coordination? 5

Who Does State-Wide Planning and Coordinating? 9

Requirements in Planning and Coordination 35

General Conclusion 45

Bibliography 47

PRECEEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE STATE PLANNING

A STATE must adopt a formal approach to state-wide planning and coordination to achieve excellence and to gain the highest possible return for every dollar invested in higher education.

WHATEVER the organization for state-wide planning and coordination may be, it must grant higher institutions the largest possible degree of autonomy within the limits of general policies necessary for a coordinated state system of higher education.

A STATE planning and coordinating agency must have a clear concept of planning and coordination.

AN AGENCY must limit itself to planning and policy-making and leave institutional management to other bodies.

MEMBERS of the board of a state agency must be the highest type of citizens who divest themselves of partisan politics.

- AN AGENCY must maintain effective liaison with the institutions, the legislature and the public.

- THE AGENCY must determine criteria for the establishment of new institutions and programs.

- THE AGENCY must have a competent staff.

- THE AGENCY must have adequate financial support.

- THE AGENCY must involve private institutions of higher learning as well as public institutions in planning and coordination.

- THE AGENCY must be suited to individual needs and problems of the state it serves.

WHY PLANNING AND COORDINATION ARE IMPORTANT

The future of higher education in the South will depend on planning and coordination within each state — the twin keys to effectiveness and quality. Planning and coordination are particularly significant to the South now because of unprecedented opportunities and unparalled responsibilities facing higher education in the region. The responsibilities spring from the largest body of college-age students yet seen in the South and from larger numbers of those determined to have a college education. One state in the South enrolled 135,000 students in its publicly supported colleges and universities in 1961, but in 1970 it will enroll 249,000. Its higher institutions must find more efficient methods of operation and more effective educational procedures within a decade or this state will have to double its educational facilities and employ more than 8,000 new faculty members. Similar problems of growth confront other Southern states. But to provide for growing numbers of students is just one of the new demands on higher education. In providing higher education, our states must take into account a new and rapidly changing technology, the unprecedented expansion of the fields of knowledge, and the emerging needs of a whole new world.

Specifically, each of our Southern states must through statewide educational systems:

(a) provide education beyond the high school (post-secondary education) of high quality for all youth who ask it and can benefit by it;

(b) provide various kinds of education—college courses, semi-professional and technical courses which prepare students for employment suited to their diversified needs and abilities;

(c) provide educational opportunities for some out-of-state students;

(d) provide continuing general education for adults;

(e) provide opportunities to up-date professional educations, *e.g.*, medicine, law, dentistry, engineering;

(f) give due emphasis and support to research;

(g) provide graduate and professional education of excellence;

(h) identify and use laboratories and highly trained personnel maintained by government or industry;

(i) coordinate facilities and programs so as to achieve the maximum educational returns for each dollar spent;

(j) keep forecasts of educational needs current with changing social conditions;

(k) provide adequate financial support for its institutions of higher learning; and,

(l) relate the services and programs of private institutions to the provisions for public higher education in the state.

These responsibilities call for more facilities, more highly qualified teachers and researchers and more money. But governors, legislators, and other thoughtful observers look with misgivings at enormous requests for appropriations to colleges and universities when they see, or think they see, unnecessary duplication of educational programs; over-expansion of course offerings; the miscellaneous addition of new institutions; the unsound extension of programs to the graduate level; and inefficient use of existing facilities—all symptoms of a lack of planning and coordination. To do away with the symptoms the Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South said,

> Every Southern state should have a central agency for long-range planning and coordination of higher education. Providing more support for a growing and diversi-

fied system of higher education requires formal state planning. Higher education has become so complex and so costly that piecemeal efforts will not get the job done. State officials must have a responsible agency to provide the complete picture of higher education in the state.[a3]

The confused condition of higher education in many of the Southern states gives weight to that statement. The confusion is most serious where there has been no planning and coordination, but it does exist in some states which have established formal arrangements for those functions. To eliminate the confusion, a state must establish an appropriate agency, but it must also take action to provide support, staff and authority that will assure the effectiveness of the agency.

The Southern states are now aware that planning and coordination can solve some of the problems of higher education. In fact, more than half of the 16 states[b] in the Southern region have taken steps to produce a planned state-wide system of state colleges and universities. From the experiences of these and other states throughout the nation we may identify what functions are performed in planning and coordination, how planning and coordination are affected, and what problems arise in the process of planning and coordination. It is the purpose of this brochure to present conclusions from these experiences to guide states which want to establish a planning and coordinating agency or which want to improve the effectiveness of agencies already established.

---

a Footnote numbers refer to bibliographical references.

b Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia.

1

WHAT IS INVOLVED IN PLANNING AND COORDINATION?

In some states central coordinating agencies were established only to reduce the expenditures for higher education or to serve as a deterrent on the expansion of educational programs and the establishment of new institutions. In fact, because some state agencies appear to serve limiting rather than developmental purposes, the concept of a state planning and coordinating board or commission has unfortunately taken on a negative connotation that must be overcome before such an agency can exercise positive leadership in the expansion and coordination of a state system of higher education.

In most states the functions performed by coordinating agencies are limited in scope and the major emphases for these bodies vary from state to state. For example, the primary concern of one central state agency is the adequate financing of the institutions of higher education in the state and the equitable distribution of funds among these institutions. Another is responsible for the total government of nine degree-granting state higher institutions including budget approval, endorsement of programs, the establishment of personnel policies, financing current operations, and planning and financing physical facilities. In still another state, the agency prepares for the governor a coordinated budget request for higher education, studies needs for higher education in the state, and recommends to the governor and legislature steps to be taken for more effective coordination of programs and allocation of functions among the institutions.

PRECEEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

Still other variations in functions of these state agencies are found among the states in the South.

Combining the functions performed by the various state coordinating agencies a fairly complete functional definition for such bodies may be formulated. Such a definition would include the following:

1. The identification of immediate and long-range post-secondary educational needs of the state.

The needs for higher education are usually determined by a series of studies including (a) an analysis of population trends and growth, and the projected growth of college enrollments over a decade or two, and (b) an analysis of current population as to age, sex, race, education, occupation, geographic distribution, trends in the rate of school attendance, persistence through high school, and the plans of high school graduates for further education, either in the state or elsewhere. Such an analysis (or series of analyses) will usually include also the abilities and vocational goals of high school seniors in relation to their educational plans, a study of the in- and out-of-state migration of students and the impact of the continuing education of adults.

2. The identification of changing economic conditions and the implications of these changes for higher education.

For example, the appearance of new industries in the field of electronics or space science may create entirely new educational needs. A state can ill afford to lose the benefits of such economic developments because it has failed to anticipate their educational implications.

3. The appraisal of plans, needs and resources of existing higher institutions, public and private, and the planning of new institutions and new facilities; when they will be needed, where they should be located, and what they will cost.

This is a primary responsibility of all state agencies which approach realistically the problems of numbers and quality in higher education. If a state is to make adequate provision for an increase of 50 or 100 per cent in its college enrollments within a decade, it must draw up a plan for the maximum utilization of its present institutions and for the establishment of new institutions so as to provide full opportunity for all qualified youth.

4. The definition of the role and scope of each publicly supported college and university.

The *role* of an institution refers to the distinctive service it will perform in its system of higher education. Shall it be a major university providing advanced degrees in a number of academic disciplines or professional programs? Shall it be an undergraduate state college offering primarily the liberal arts or liberal arts combined with majors in such fields as education or business administration? Shall it be a technical college with primary emphasis on engineering, space science and related fields? Shall it be a community junior college or a two-year technical institute? Shall it be a teachers college whose primary function is the preparation of public school teachers?

Once the role of an institution is defined, the *scope* of its program must be determined. If it is a university, what shall be the range of its offerings? Shall it include community planning, engineering or engineering science, space science, the classical languages or public health? If its role is defined to be teacher education, shall the scope of its program be limited to the preparation of elementary teachers or shall it include secondary and possibly junior college teachers? Shall it include the preparation of special teachers of the handicapped, teachers of music, art, business courses, or physical education? Shall it undertake the preparation of supervisors, librarians, directors of bands, orchestras, and choral groups? Similar questions need to be raised concerning the scope and activities of each higher institution once its role in a system of state higher education has been defined.

The scope of a state-wide system of higher education must be considered along with the scope of institutional offerings. For example, how many institutions offering doctoral programs are needed? How many can the state afford? The same questions must be asked regarding medicine, dentistry, law and other professional programs. Here, too, arises the problem of decentralizing undergraduate education and concentrating on more costly advanced programs.

The institutions themselves will be, or should be, the first to recognize the folly of unnecessary and expensive duplications in facilities and in programs or of unwarranted

competition for distinguished teachers and research scholars in highly specialized fields. The spirit of educational adventure in our higher institutions must forever be encouraged but their ambitions must fit into a rational system of higher education that the state can support. Therefore, it is necessary with the full cooperation of the institutions to define the range and level of their programs and operations.

5. The appraisal and/or approval of the operations of each state higher institution.

This function has a wide range of ramifications. In some states it carries with it considerable governing responsibility. In others it is largely advisory in nature. Among the more significant activities usually comprehended in this category of functions are the approval of new programs, the establishment of personnel policies, reviewing, consolidating, and approving or recommending institutional budget requests, establishing uniform accounting and reporting procedures, planning and financing physical facilities, and promulgating new educational methods and procedures designed to improve quality in higher education.

6. The conduct of continuing studies to keep information about higher education and its needs up to date.

The conditions affecting higher education do not remain static. Therefore, continuing studies must be made to identify the direction and magnitude of changing conditions—population growth, economic development, and resources for the support of higher education. State-wide plans may have to be revised in the light of new findings.

While such studies may be made by the research units within state colleges or universities, they must be planned and coordinated on a state-wide basis. Experience suggests that these studies can be done best by an independent staff.

WHO DOES STATE-WIDE PLANNING AND COORDINATING?

In states where no legally established planning and coordinating body exists, the governor and the legislature are compelled to assume planning and coordinating responsibilities. They must make appropriations for the support of higher education. They must approve the expansion of existing institutions and the establishment of new institutions. They must approve salary schedules and personnel policies. In fact, the governor and the legislature must of necessity exercise far-reaching controls over the higher institutions of the state. Seldom, however, are they guided by long-range plans and policies based on comprehensive studies of educational needs and appraisals of the adequacy of existing institutions to meet emerging needs. Governors and legislatures in a number of states have taken initiative to create a planning and coordinating agency because they are under increasing pressure to make decisions affecting higher education and because they lack information on which to make a sound judgement.

Each state must establish a plan of coordination that is adapted to its particular problems and needs. Broadly speaking there are three types of organization—a single central governing and coordinating board, a planning and coordinating agency superimposed on existing institutional boards, and a so-called voluntary coordinating body.*

* There are also in a number of states limited provisions for coordination—for example, all state colleges under a single board, or a group of institutions having related functions operating under a single board. These are not discussed except as they may be referred to incidentally.

While each state must decide for itself what type of central planning and coordinating organization will best serve its needs, certain basic considerations can be kept in mind. Briefly stated they are:

1. The responsibilities and authority of a central agency must be clearly defined.
2. The central agency must differentiate clearly between planning and policy making for purposes of cordination on the one hand, and the administration of institutions on the other. Institutional management is the responsibility of officers appointed for that purpose.
3. Members of the central agency must be the highest type of citizens who divest themselves of partisan politics.
4. The central agency must maintain consistency and continuity in purposes, policies, and functions. A frequent turnover in membership is likely to result in a loss of perspective and may lead to discontinuity in purposes and policies.
5. The central agency must maintain effective liaison with the institutions, the legislature and the public.
6. The central agency must determine criteria for the establishment of new programs and new institutions.
7. The central agency must have an adequate and competent staff.
8. The central agency must have adequate financial support.

These considerations are discussed more fully following illustrations of the three types of organization already noted —a single coordinating-governing board, a planning and coordinating agency superimposed on existing institutional boards, and a so-called voluntary coordinating body—as they are found in each state.

A SINGLE COORDINATING-GOVERNING BOARD

The most completely centralized plan of coordination and control is a single board having direct and complete responsi-

bility for all of the state's colleges and universities, without local boards for either single institutions or groups of institutions. Florida, Georgia, and Mississippi have this form of organization. Several non-Southern states also have this type of organization, notably Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, and South Dakota. In some states, Georgia, for example, the jurisdiction of the central board extends to all higher institutions. In Florida and Mississippi, the state boards are responsible for only degree-granting institutions. Two-year colleges in these states are under a separate state level board or under a state department of education.

The single board combines coordinating and governing functions. The widest range of responsibility and corresponding authority for higher education is vested in these single boards.

GEORGIA

The Regents of the University System of Georgia, established more than three decades ago, performs broad functions and exercises highly centralized control. The Board has 15 members appointed by the governor with advice and consent of the senate, each for a term of seven years. All publicly supported higher institutions, including junior colleges, 19 in all, come under the jurisdiction of this Board. The Regents are in theory and in fact a governing-coordinating board. The Board is responsible on the one hand for determining the higher educational needs of the state and for the establishment of needed institutions and facilities, and on the other hand, for defending the higher institutions against unwarranted interference by the legislature, governor, or special interest groups. In evaluating its own activities, the Board would probably say that it has been so preoccupied with the operations of the institutions that it has done less long-range planning and coordination than would be desirable.

To the credit of the Board it should be said that on the whole it has discharged its responsibility so effectively that there is no disposition on the part of the institutions, citizens, or the legislature to seek changes in its functions.

Among the specific responsibilities assigned the Board are the approval of institutional budgets and the submission to the legislature of a consolidated budget for higher education in the state; the annual allocation of funds to the various units of the system; the general supervision of the fiscal management of all higher institutions; the establishment of personnel policies, governing both professional and non-professional appointments; the general supervision of the use of physical facilities, and the approval of plans for buildings; the approval of plans for the establishment of new institutions or of branches of existing institutions; the approval of new programs or new degrees; the allocations of programs and services among the higher institutions of the state, and the development of long-range plans to meet future higher education needs. The annual reports of the Regents to the governor contain extensive data derived from continuing studies of faculty appointments, rank, salaries, workload, the number of graduates distributed by institutions in fields of specialization, enrollments, instructional programs, scholarships, research, library, public services, finance, physical facilities.

Georgia has a true, state-wide system of higher education. Its effectiveness is determined by a single board endowed with comprehensive authority and far-reaching responsibilities by the state constitution and by statutes.

FLORIDA

The responsibilities of the Board of Control of Florida Higher Institutions are equally inclusive, but this Board differs from the Board of Regents in Georgia in two respects. First, it has no jurisdiction over junior colleges; second, it is subject to the supervision of the State Board of Education. In practice, by an agreement between the Board of Control and the Board of Education, the Board of Control is given final jurisdiction except in matters relating to the qualification and selection of chief administrative officers, the establishment of new institutions, the admission of students, and types of educational programs to be provided. The fact that planning and coordination of higher education in Florida has commanded widespread attention may be attributed to the wisdom and vision of the Board of Control. In anticipation of large college enrollments likely to occur in Florida's

higher institutions in the 60's, the Board of Control established the Council for the Study of Higher Education in 1954 to make a comprehensive study of educational needs of the state over a 20-year period and to recommend how these needs might be met. The report of the Council has served as a guide in the development of plans and its recommendations have been followed quite consistently.

In recent years the Board has conducted a series of continuing studies on enrollment trends, class size, cost of instruction and space utilization. Regularly, it makes an analysis of the budget requests of each institution and prepares a consolidated budget for consideration by the budget commission and the legislature. The Board has also made a restudy of enrollment projections and a special study of the needs in the field of advanced space science and technology.

A most important and far-reaching step taken by the Board has been comprehensive study of the role and scope of each institution. This study was initiated with full cooperation of the degree-granting state universities. Local committees and task forces first conducted studies of instructional programs, enrollments and long-range plans for development on each campus. The institutional reports were reviewed by the chief administrative officers and when approved were presented to the executive officer of the Board of Control. These reports, which consisted of a summary and supporting documents, were analyzed with a view to finding areas of conflict, areas of proposed expansion, and also to determine implications in terms of personnel, space and financial requirements. This process identified a number of areas of overlap and duplication in existing or proposed programs. To resolve apparent conflicts objectively and impartially, teams of distinguished consultants were invited to study the reports, to visit the institutions concerned and to make recommendations about the allocation of educational functions.

A role and scope study of this type is never completed in ultimate and final form. Continuing studies will reveal new facts on the basis of which changes in policies and programs will be made.

MISSISSIPPI

The Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning in Mississippi is comparable in some ways to the Regents of the University System of Georgia. One main difference is that the Mississippi Board governs only degree-granting institutions—nine in all—while the Georgia Board governs junior colleges as well.

The Mississippi Board consists of 13 members appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. Twelve members serve for 12-year terms, and 1 member serves a limited 4-year term. The Mississippi Board is first and foremost a governing board. Its responsibilities include approval and consolidation of budgets for the state institutions of higher education, approval of educational programs and degrees, establishment of personnel policies, the financial support of current operations, and planning and financing physical facilities.

The Board regularly conducts studies of special needs for higher education in the state and recommends new services and educational functions only in light of the total state program of higher education. The Board undertakes to maintain adequate quality of instruction by providing equitable financial support among the institutions. Highly specialized and expensive departments are supported only when the need for them is clearly demonstrated. In arriving at allocations of funds among the institutions such matters as the functions of the institution, instructional needs, equipment needs, enrollments, salary schedules, and other sources of income are taken into account. From the data at its command the Board's staff has developed objective formulas for preparing estimates of need to submit to the legislature and for distributing funds actually appropriated.

The 1962 session of the Mississippi legislature mandated the Board of Trustees to make a detailed study of the programs, degrees, and courses offered in each of the state institutions. On the completion of the study the Board "shall make such adjustments as may be found necessary in the programs of the various institutions to the end that the broadest possible educational opportunities shall be offered to the citizens of this state without inefficient and needless

duplication." This constitutes a mandate to the Board to make a role and scope study. The legislation also directs the Board to give particular attention to extension programs of the various senior colleges and authorizes it to improve and coordinate those programs so as to generally strengthen the state's entire educational program. The 1962 statutes also give the Board the authority to establish minimum standards of achievement for students to remain in a state institution and a prerequisite for entrance into any of the institutions under its jurisdiction "which standards need not be uniform between the various institutions and may be based upon such criteria as the Board may establish."

Other examples of governing-coordinating boards outside of the South might be given.* Those cited will suffice, however, to illustrate variations in the composition and functions of these boards. The effectiveness of these boards, regardless of composition or function, depends upon the leadership which they exercise. The mere existence of a governing-coordinating board, no matter how sound its plan of organization, gives no assurance of the effectiveness of its operation.

THE LIAISON COORDINATING BOARD

The liaison coordinating board serves as an intermediary between higher institutions that have their own boards and the state legislative and administrative agencies. In so. states these intermediate boards have limited responsibilitie. largely advisory in nature. In others they have a wide range of coordinating responsibilities. Boards of this type, endowed with varying degrees of authority and responsibility, are found in Arkansas, Kentucky, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia. The legislature of Maryland in 1963 established a liaison coordinating agency which will become operative July 1, 1963. Some notes on the membership and activities of each of these coordinating agencies will clarify their rule.

ARKANSAS

The Commission on Coordination of Higher Education Finance created in a special session of the General Assembly

* Oregon, Montana, Iowa, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota.

in 1961 is composed of ten members appointed for ten-year terms, one each year.

The system of higher education consists of seven state colleges and a university, which includes a separate medical school. Each of these institutions is governed by a separate board, whose establishment and powers are provided for in the Constitution of Arkansas.

The Commission serves in an advisory and recommending capacity to the general assembly and the governor of the state. Its functions are:

1. To evaluate and coordinate the budget requests for the university and state colleges, and to submit them as a single recommendation to the general assembly.
2. To conduct continuing studies at the university and state colleges in all matters involving finance and capital improvements, and, based on these studies, to submit recommendations to the governor and the general assembly and to each of the institutions of its findings, together with plans for implementing such recommendations.
3. To adopt uniform definitions and forms for academic reporting, academic statistics, and any other areas involving information necessary to make its recommendations.

In the future the Commission plans to develop a statement of the specific role of each institution in order to establish guidelines for financing. Where possible, the Commission plans to develop unit expenditures in order to judge how adequately the institutions are financed. It will also conduct a continuing study of the growth of institutions and their programs with the intention that, as additional funds become available, the growth and development of these institutions will become orderly and efficient.

KENTUCKY

The Council on Public Higher Education in Kentucky was created by statute in 1934. Until 1962, it consisted of 18 members including the presidents of the state university and of each of the 5 state colleges; 1 member other than the

Superintendent of Public Instruction from the board of regents of each of the state colleges, selected by the board of each respective college; 3 appointive members of the Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky, selected by that Board; 2 lay members of the State Board of Education, selected by that Board; the dean of the College of Education of the University of Kentucky; and the Superintendent of Public Instruction who serves as chairman of the Council; also 3 non-voting members designated by the Kentucky Association of Colleges, Secondary Schools and Elementary Schools to participate in matters relating to teacher education and certification. The provisions for membership of the Council are somewhat unusual in that it is made up almost completely of administrators and board members of the institutions whose programs, fees and budgets are to be coordinated. The presidents of all public and non-public institutions of higher education are invited to attend meetings of the Council. Letters of invitation and agenda are sent to them each time.

The chief responsibilities allocated to the Council were to coordinate the work and determine the curricular offerings of the state institutions of higher learning; to represent the state in its administrative relationships with the Southern Regional Education Board; to determine the amount of entrance fees and qualifications for admission to each institution; to consider budgetary requirements of each institution, and on the basis of the needs indicated by individual budgets, recommend to the Department of Finance a budget covering the needs of the institutions.

A special committee authorized by the Kentucky legislature and appointed by the governor in 1960 was critical both of the composition of the Council and its achievements. Subsequently (1962), the membership of the Council was expanded by legislation that provided for the addition of three laymen who are appointed by the governor. The statute providing for this change also tightens administrative procedures of the Council by specifying that two unexcused absences from regularly scheduled meetings shall be grounds for disqualification of a member. There was also a supplemental appropriation to provide the Council with staff per-

sonnel. The Council's main responsibilities continue to be those assigned to the original Council.

NORTH CAROLINA

The North Carolina Board of Higher Education was created by statute in 1955. The Board's responsibility, broadly stated, is "to plan and promote the development of a sound, vigorous, progressive, and coordinated system of higher education in the State." More specifically it is responsible for allocating the major functions and activities of each of the state institutions in keeping with the purposes for which the institution was established, determining the types of degrees to be awarded by each of the institutions, prescribing uniform statistical reporting practices for all institutions, and reviewing and appraising the biennial budget requests for all institutions. Other accomplishments of the Board include the sponsorship of a state scholarship-loan program for prospective school teachers, a state-wide cooperative study of teacher education, the Community College Act of 1957, an Act that defined the roles and functions of senior colleges, a planning study for higher education that resulted in long-range recommendations for capital expenditures through 1970, studies of plant utilization, state support for credit courses offered to undergraduates in summer sessions, and uniform admissions testing.

The Board of Higher Education consists of nine lay members appointed by the governor, subject to confirmation by the house and senate in joint session. Members are appointed for overlapping terms of eight years. The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School in 1962 recommended that the Board be reorganized to include institutional representatives, but this recommendation was not included in the Higher Education Bill in the 1963 general assembly. Presidents of all tax-supported higher education institutions and presidents of five private colleges are regularly invited (since December 1962) to attend meetings of the Board.

The Board is not a governing board. The Consolidated University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill, North Carolina State College in Raleigh, Woman's College in Greensboro)

and the other 14 colleges (including 5 community colleges) each have separate boards of trustees. Under the Higher Education Bill enacted in 1963 provision was made for 3 of the 5 community colleges to become senior colleges, state supported, and for the 2 remaining community colleges and others that may be established to come under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education. Requests before the 1963 general assembly, if approved, will increase the total staff to 10—5 professional and 5 clerical.

OKLAHOMA

There are 18 colleges and universities in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education. The State System as it now exists was established in 1941, when the people of the state adopted an amendment to the Constitution of Oklahoma which vested in a single board, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, responsibilities for coordination and state-wide planning. The State Regents include nine members who are appointed by the governor and confirmed by the state senate for overlapping terms of nine years. The Constitution of Oklahoma defines the responsibilities of the coordinating board of control as follows:

1. It shall prescribe standards of higher education applicable to each institution;
2. It shall determine the functions and courses of study at each of the institutions to conform to the standards prescribed;
3. It shall grant degrees and other forms of academic recognition for completion of the prescribed courses in all of such institutions;
4. It shall recommend to the state legislature the budget allocations for each institution; and,
5. It shall have the power to recommend to the legislature proposed fees for all of such institutions and any such fees shall be effective only within the limits prescribed by the legislature.

The Constitution also provides that the State Regents shall allocate funds to each institution "according to its needs

and functions" from lump-sum appropriations made by the Oklahoma legislature to the State Regents.

Each institution has a governing board; however, some governing boards operate more than one institution. One board is responsible for the government of eight institutions, a second for six, and each of the remaining four boards is responsible for a single institution.

In 1962 the Regents began a comprehensive study called the Oklahoma Self-Study of Higher Education. In broad outline, it includes topics previously suggested in the discussion of role and scope.

In addition to the institutions and agencies of the State System, the study includes the 15 independent and municipal colleges and universities in the state . . . also educational programs of proprietary and other trade, technical, and vocational schools in Oklahoma.

Findings from the study will guide the Regents and the public in efforts to improve the Oklahoma system of higher education and will serve as a map for future planning in higher education.

SOUTH CAROLINA

In 1961 the governor of South Carolina appointed a seven-member Advisory Committee on Higher Education. The Committee was responsible for studying higher education needs of the state to develop a long-range program dealing with both the academic and the financial problems confronting the state's colleges and universities. As background material this Committee received a report prepared by a joint legislative committee created in 1959.

The legislative committee's report said (a) that there was need for a study in greater breadth and depth than the Committee was able to undertake, and (b) that a system of junior colleges was highly desirable in providing greater opportunities for the increasing number of students seeking an education beyond the high school.

The Governor's Advisory Committee on Higher Education, in March 1962, presented a master plan for "a renaissance in higher education in South Carolina" to the general

assembly of the state. Legislation was promptly enacted in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee and set up the State Advisory Commission on Higher Education consisting of seven members appointed by the governor. The commission makes continuing studies of the problems of higher education in the state and submits recommendations at least annually to the governor, to the State Budget and Control Board and to the general assembly. The Commission's capacity is advisory only. It was the Committee's judgement that a centralized authoritative board was not desirable and would not meet with the approval of the general assembly nor of the institutions. The plan provided that the Commission should organize a Council of Presidents, consisting of the presidents of the six state supported institutions to make continuing studies of their common problems, both in the academic and the administrative fields. The Council has been organized and is now functioning.

TEXAS

The Texas Commission on Higher Education created by statute in 1955 is composed of 15 lay members, each of whom is appointed by the governor for a 6-year term with the advice and consent of the senate. There are 10 separate boards of regents in the state, some of which are responsible for more than one institution. There are in all 19 academic institutions, 3 medical schools and 1 dental school. The Texas Education Agency has jurisdiction over 33 junior colleges.

The statute which created the Commission stated the following main purposes and objectives which the Commission is expected to serve:

> The purpose of this Act is to establish in the field of public higher education in the State of Texas an agency of the State through which additional leadership and coordinating services can be provided for the senior higher education systems and institutions and their governing boards, to the end that an efficient and effective State system of higher education may be developed.

In the fulfillment of this general mission, the legislature charged the Commission with a number of specific duties

and responsibilities, including the following:

1. Continuing study of the program and degree offerings of the fully state supported colleges and universities in relation to the needs of the state.
2. Continuing study of the needs of the state for research and for extension and public services and the designation of institutions to conduct these activities (insofar as they are financed with state funds).
3. Maintenance of inventories of research programs and extension and public service activities which are conducted by the several fully state supported institutions.
4. Granting or withholding of approval of proposed new departments, degree programs, and certificate programs and, within certain limits, consolidation or elimination of existing programs where such action is in the best interests of the institutions and the general requirements of the state.
5. Development and prescription (with certain other state agencies) of a uniform system of reporting in the field of public higher education and serving as the single state facility through which all state reports on higher education are channeled.
6. Making continuing studies of the financial needs of public higher education in the state and the development and designation of formulas for use by the several institutions in making requests for legislative appropriations.
7. Preparation and submission of recommendations to the budget offices and the legislature concerning all phases of higher education appropriation requests, including initial receipt of requests from the several institutions.
8. Preparation and submission of recommendations to the budget offices and the legislature for supplemental contingent appropriations to provide for enrollment increases.

9. Making of a continuing study of all phases of senior public higher education in Texas, whether expressly enumerated herein or not, for the purpose of improving its effectiveness and efficiency, and make appropriate reports thereon.

The Commission approves or disapproves a change of status of publicly supported institutions.

The Commission regularly conducts staff studies and recommends changes in tuition, the support of libraries, the elimination of courses or programs, and interinstitutional coordination of programs.

One of the most significant achievements of the Texas Commission on Higher Education has been the development of formulas used by the institutions in making requests for legislative appropriations. Formulas for this purpose have been established in the areas of general administration, teaching salaries, library, building and maintenance, and custodial services. The purpose of these formulas is to secure an equitable distribution of state funds available for the support of higher education. Some authorities in higher education doubt the wisdom of using such formulas for determining the validity of an institutional budget request, because there is danger of the formulas becoming fixed and inflexible, and also because there are intangible factors to be considered that cannot be reduced to the formula. It must be conceded, however, that the Commission has demonstrated a significant approach to the complex problem of validating institutional requests for legislative appropriations.

VIRGINIA

The Virginia State Council for Higher Education was established in 1956 as an advisory body to the governor and general assembly to promote the development of a coordinated system of public higher education. Although the Council was given broadly defined power by the enabling legislation, it nevertheless encountered difficulty in establishing an effective role for itself during the first few years. By 1961, however, it began to emerge as a positive force in higher education and gained renewed backing from the governor,

the legislature and the colleges in its search for a cooperative approach to a coordinated program.

The Council consists of eight members representing the state-at-large (with due consideration given to geographical distribution of membership), and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, ex-officio. Members serve for staggered terms of four years and are eligible for reappointment for one additional term. After serving eight years, no member is eligible for further service on the Council until two years have elapsed.

The enabling legislation directs the Council to develop state-wide policies in higher education, to define the role and scope of each institution, and to coordinate the educational budget. Implicit in these responsibilities is the obligation to eliminate unnecessary duplication, to review new educational programs (including plans for new community colleges), and to develop meaningful appraisals of educational costs. Subsequent general assemblies have restricted the Council's activities in budget coordination. Its activities in the fiscal area have accordingly been limited to the development of a uniform state-wide system for accounting and reporting of educational income and expenditures.

The Council's coordinating authority extends to 24 state supported institutions of higher learning, 12 of which are 2-year branches or 4-year divisions of 4 major institutions—the University of Virginia, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the College of William and Mary, and the Virginia State College. Among the institutions, there are 3 universities, 7 residential 4-year colleges, 3 community 4-year colleges and 9 community 2-year colleges.

A key to the Council's growing effectiveness is its use of an Advisory Committee on Coordination consisting of the college presidents and representatives from each of the eight college governing boards. Major questions on coordination are first submitted to the Advisory Committee before fundamental policy recommendations are developed. The Advisory Committee, in turn, appoints sub-committees to study the questions in detail. Members of the Council staff and other state agencies, as well as representatives from the college faculties and administrations, assist the subcommittees

in assembling statistical data and analyzing technical problems. Outside consultants are employed on numerous studies, such as the current studies in medical education, teacher education, and vocational-technical education.

Self-determination has been a very strong tradition among the public colleges of Virginia, but there is growing recognition of the need for balanced growth and development in the face of explosive pressures for greater opportunities in higher education. The need is compounded by other public services such as extension and research now demanded of a state's institutions. Many of the problems of coordination still remain to be solved, but the state generally recognizes that the most effective approach to their solution is cooperation rather than competition.

STATE AGENCIES OUTSIDE THE SOUTH

State agencies of the liaison coordinating board type are also found outside of the Southern region. Two of these, one in New Mexico and one in California, will be reviewed briefly because they are interesting examples of liaison-type boards not found in Southern states.

NEW MEXICO

The Board of Educational Finance in New Mexico is composed of nine members appointed by the governor for overlapping six-year terms. This Board coordinates financial affairs of seven state institutions of higher education, each having its own board of regents. It is concerned primarily with adequate and equitable financing of the state's higher institutions. It reviews institutional budgets and approves them before they are submitted to the state budget officer. While the scope of the Board's responsibility appears to be limited, its influence is far-reaching—"He who controls the purse controls the program."

In the opinion of some educators this oblique approach to program analysis and coordination leaves much to be desired. They believe that responsibility for educational planning and coordination should be given as a specific assignment instead of deriving from an unstated assumption. However, within the boundaries set by the New Mexico legislature the

Board has made a commendable contribution to the budgetary coordination and the financial operations of the state's higher institutions.

CALIFORNIA

California has a tri-partite system of education including (or comprised of) 70 junior colleges, 17 state colleges, and a state university which operates on 9 campuses.[12] There are, in addition, more than 60 private colleges and universities in the state.

This state is confronted with unparalleled need to expand its educational facilities and consequently for state-wide planning and coordination. Recent studies indicate that by 1975 the full-time enrollment in California's higher institutions will be 661,000, about three times the enrollment of 1961-62.

Each of the 3 major divisions of the state's higher educational institutions has developed under a separate plan of administrative organization and control. The University of California and its several campuses operate under the Regents of the University of California. The 15 state colleges and their subdivisions are responsible to the Trustees of the State College System. Each junior college is under the government of a local board, but the State Board of Education has general supervisory responsibility for the junior colleges. In addition, the California Maritime Academy operates under a separate Board of Governors responsible directly to the State Department of Education.

Historically, the state has been concerned about the coordination of higher education. As early as 1899 the California Educational Commission, recommended that the legislature provide a uniform board for governing the normal schools. Periodically since then, the problem of coordination has been under consideration. Tangible results may be attributed to these earlier efforts, but the basic issue, the need for coordination, persists. Since 1945 a liaison committee of the Regents of the University and the State Board of Education has studied enrollment developments and has made studies of the need for additional centers of public higher education.[19] The most recent step toward coordination was

the creation of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education by the legislature in 1960. This Council consists of three representatives from each of the major segments of higher education—the university, the state colleges, and the junior colleges—three representatives of private colleges and three representatives of the general public.

The chief functions assigned to the Council by the statute creating it are:

1. To review the annual budget and capital outlay requests of the university and the state colleges and to make recommendations to the governor and and to the legislature on these requests.
2. To interpret the functional differences among the three major divisions of higher institutions in terms of statutes, the master plan for higher education, and existing agreements and to recommend needed changes.
3. To develop plans and recommendations for the orderly growth of higher education in California.

The Council is defined as an agency of "cooperation not coercion." Its relationship is an advisory one to the governor, the legislature and the governing boards of the higher institutions.

The effective discharge of functions assigned to the Coordinating Council requires studies of various phases of higher education and of social and economic developments in California. Some of the areas studied by the Council are: the need for medical education; extension services and adult education; faculty salaries and fringe benefits; financing junior colleges; student fees; standards for space utilization; enrollments and enrollment policies; needs for new institutions, their sites and locations; and unit costs.

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education in California represents a significant development, both in the scope of its functions and in the magnitude of the problems with which it must deal.

VOLUNTARY COORDINATION

Voluntary cooperation and coordination among higher institutions is not a new concept. It has existed in various

forms and in varying degrees in a number of states. It cannot be clearly divorced from the two types of coordination previously discussed because voluntary coordination occurs in numerous ways where there are either governing-coordinating boards or liaison boards. Also, where so-called voluntary coordinating agency is established in response to a legislative directive as in Indiana, the question may well be raised as to how voluntary the organization really is. In other instances a voluntary relationship has become formalized through the establishment of a continuing organization. Three examples of formalized voluntary coordination—found in Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan—are included here.

INDIANA

The Indiana plan is dual in nature. It involves interrelationships among the four state institutions and includes relationships between public and private higher institutions in the state. The 1949 biennial session of the Indiana legislature attached the following rider to the appropriation act:

> Provided: That the four state universities and colleges shall cooperate in working out a formula to be presented periodically to the legislature and any other proper authorities for budgetary purposes. Such formulae are to be based upon beneficial data such as the following: cost per student for on-campus and off-campus, number of students including the numbers in each department, the number of out-of-state students, housing costs, etc.

In response to this directive the presidents of the four state higher institutions arranged for cooperative studies of academic programs, physical plants, and financial administration. These studies were subsequently expanded to include a number of other areas. The essential point is that by this cooperative procedure requests for appropriations for each institution were agreed upon and were supported by all of the presidents. By the same process plans for coordinating educational programs have been worked out. Especially noteworthy are cooperative programs leading to the doctor's degree that are currently in effect.

The second phase of voluntary coordination in Indiana involves the relationship between public and private institutions in the state. Through a state organization of all publicly and privately supported colleges and universities, the private institutions have been aided substantially in the conduct of studies designed to assist them to define their role in the state system of higher education and to maintain close cooperative relationships with the state institutions.

OHIO

The Ohio inter-university council has been in operation more than 20 years. Six state universities participate, each being represented by a member of the board of trustees, the president of the university, and the chief financial officer. The council has been concerned with cost studies, policies relating to admission and retention of students, faculty research and conditions of faculty service. From all of the evidence available it appears that the council has not assumed responsibility or leadership in long-range state-wide planning, or in dealing with some of the more fundamental issues of interinstitutional coordination. Morever, the council appears to have taken few, if any, steps toward including private institutions in its purview of interinstitutional coordination.

MICHIGAN

The State of Michigan has been the scene of considerable rivalry among state institutions while at the same time they publicly profess cooperation among themselves. The Council of State College Presidents in Michigan, representing ten publicly supported higher insitutions, has a number of achievements to its credit. Particularly noteworthy are studies relating to the growth in school and college enrollment, the projected economic growth of the state, and studies in various program areas, including pharmacy, forestry, music and extension services. Most of these studies were made by teams of faculty members from participating institutions. In contrast to the voluntary agencies of some other states, particularly Indiana, this Council has done little in the area of finance. Evaluating the situation in Michigan, Dr. John Dale Russell, in a report of the *Survey of Higher Education in Michigan*,[23]

recommended that the legislature establish a board for the coordination and control of the state programs of higher education in Michigan and that each institution under the coordinating agency's jurisdiction should have its own governing board. In effect this recommendation provided for the establishment of a liaison coordinating board.

The only consequence of the action recommended by Dr. Russell, thus far, has been that the presidents of the public institutions of Michigan took steps to strengthen the Michigan Council of State College Presidents.

ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF VOLUNTARY COORDINATION

Voluntary coordination has some very staunch advocates. Their main arguments are:

> It preserves the autonomy of the institution. It affords institutions freedom to advance the quality of their programs without restraint or dictation by an external agency. Coordination is achieved by persons directly responsible for and intimately acquainted with the institutions involved.
>
> It recognizes the nature of a college or university as a developmental arm of society rather than as an element in a department of state government.
>
> It is a means of establishing mutual confidence among the administrative officers of the institutions.
>
> It enables the institutions to present a united front to the legislature.

The advocates of voluntary coordination recognize, however, that "a reasonable degree of state-wide coordination must be achieved and maintained because taxpayers and legislators rightly demand it."[2]

A limitation of systems of voluntary coordination is that they tend to preserve the status quo of institutions. Also, the participants in coordination are representatives of the institutions themselves who act without the benefit of lay members representing the public interest. In the words of Lanier Cox, vice-chancellor, the University of Texas:

> Voluntary coordination has the advantage of maintaining institutional autonomy, but its success is entirely dependent upon individual willingness to cooperate and the extent of that willingness has been directly related to the absence of competing interests. Not wanting to be told how to run his own institution, a college president is hesitant to set a precedent by joining and telling another of his presidential colleagues how to run his. Even if decisions are reached, continual adherence or compliance is only as binding as the compulsion to comply. Coordination which goes only so far as gentlemen's agreements in support for requests for increased appropriations is not enough.*

Some of the other limitations of the voluntary approach to achieving "a reasonable degree of state-wide coordination" will become apparent from comparisons with other plans still to be discussed.

AN EVALUATION OF APPROACHES TO PLANNING AND COORDINATION

This resume of plans for state-wide coordination currently found in some states gives a general idea of variations that occur both in organization and in responsibilities of coordinating bodies. It is difficult to evaluate these plans and the way they operate comparatively. Dr. Lyman Glenny has summarized some advantages and criticisms of coordinating agencies of the types under consideration from the point of view of those who are affected by them either as legislators and state officers or as representatives of institutions.[5]

Briefly summarized, some of the major benefits reported by Glenny are:

> Conflicts and tensions among institutions are reduced or eliminated;
>
> Public attention is focused on a system of higher education rather than on individual institutions;
>
> Legislators and state officers are more favorably disposed toward higher education than before the coordinating agency was established;

* State Systems of Higher Education for the Future. An unpublished manuscript.

Institutions are better off financially;

Differential functions of institutions are established and protected;

Long-range plans for capital construction are approved and supported by legislatures;

Program offerings are enriched as a result of reduction or elimination of unnecessary duplication;

Both the institutions and the legislators are relieved from pressures by alumni and special interest groups;

Institutional officers do not find it necessary to compete for funds at sessions of the legislature and are therefore free to devote time to the problems of their respective institutions; and,

Legislators and state officers find it advantageous both as a means of keeping informed and of long-range planning to rely upon a single executive officer of the agency.

Certain criticisms reported by Glenny also need to be noted. Some of these criticisms were more widespread than others. More important among them are the following:

Weak leadership by the executive officers of agencies;

Continued uneconomical operation resulting from unnecessary overlap and duplication;

Lack of adequate procedures or data for the formulation of operating and capital budgets; and,

Failure to make proper allowance for special programs of individual institutions.

This compression of benefits and criticisms does scant justice to Glenny's more complete summary. It will suffice, however, to illustrate points pro and con. After weighing criticisms against benefits, Glenny concludes that the benefits of coordination outweigh any disadvantages.

Among activities reported by some of the state agencies the following are particularly noteworthy:

1. Completion of initial studies of higher educational needs of the state to provide long-range plans for the expansion of existing institutions and for the establishment of new ones.

2. The study of current use of space and future space needs as a guide to the management and expansion of physical facilities.
3. The establishment of a state-wide reporting system that provides comparable data on enrollments for all institutions.
4. The development of a uniform budget format and system of accounting to assure that financial data provided by the institutions will be comparable.
5. The development and adoption by the institutions of formulae for determining teaching loads, and costs, etc.
6. The presentation of consolidated requests to the legislature for appropriations for the state higher institutions which are granted in substantially the form and amount requested.

REQUIREMENTS IN PLANNING AND COORDINATION

The road to a well planned and coordinated system of higher education is not smooth. A number of conditions can limit or even neutralize the effectiveness of the best laid plans. Some of these conditions are of such a nature that they cannot be readily anticipated. Others are so obvious that they can be identified without difficulty. The following summary of the more obvious problems is drawn from the experiences of state planning and coordinating boards.

1. A state planning and coordination agency must have a clear conception of the meaning of planning and coordination.

Planning must be thought of in long-range terms. It must comprehend diversified forms of education to meet the needs of students who have diversified abilities, interests, and goals. It must include professional and specialized education appropriate to the social and economic needs of the state. Higher education in a state may be thought of as a pyramid of which the broad base is provided by community junior colleges or their equivalent, the intermediate level is represented by degree-granting state colleges and undergraduate university programs and the apex consists of highly specialized graduate and professional instruction and research. Some such concept must constitute the starting point in state planning.

Coordination must also be conceived in terms of the geographic location of institutions and of the educational programs to be provided. Emerging centers of population resulting from new industry or other economic activities may call

PRECEEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

for new higher educational facilities. Changing socio-economic conditions may require marked changes and adaptations in a state system of higher education; *e.g.,* bringing educational opportunities near the homes of students. Also geographical barriers, mountains, lakes, rivers, must be given consideration in determining the accessibility of higher educational opportunities to the citizens of the state.

The coordination of educational programs involves such matters as the identification of program areas in which duplications are either justified or unwarranted; the determination of limits to be placed on state colleges aspiring to become state universities; the allocation of highly specialized programs; and a decision as to how costly and highly specialized research can be organized and conducted so as to bring maximum returns to the state, the region, and the nation.

2. A state planning and coordinating board must differentiate between planning and policy-making on the one hand and institutional management on the other. It is not the function of a state board, whether it be coordinating board or a single board of control, to engage in the administration of individual institutions.

In Florida, as part of a state-wide study of higher education, an analysis was made of the activities of the Board of Control—a single board for all degree-granting institutions. The analysis showed that at that time the Board was preoccupied with administrative matters. It was observed that "not only does this militate against effective administration of the institutions but it dissipates the energies of the Board of Control and leaves little time for the kind of activities in which it could more profitably engage."

> *Formulation of policies* under which programs of instruction, research, and service are to be carried out *is the function of the Board of Control,* but *the administration of the institutions* and the performance of the professional services *are the proper functions of the presidents and their administrative and academic staffs. Failure of a lay board to refrain from administrative and executive actions reduces the possibility that such services will be effectively or efficiently performed,* and it

precludes the possibility of holding administrative officers responsible.*[14]

Essential functions to be performed by the state board—identified in the same report were:

Determining what programs of instruction, research, and service are to be provided.

Determining what institutional facilities and staff are required to perform the services and to provide approved programs.

Determining what financial support is required for the various programs in the several institutions.

Making and reviewing policies under which the system is operated.

Appointing the chief administrative officers of the institutions and approving faculty appointments involving tenure.

Supervising the system to determine that its operation is within established policies.

Above all, the central agency must encourage institutional initiative and dynamic institutional leadership. Giving full reign to institutions within patterns and policies established for state-wide coordination will be an incentive to the achievement of excellence.

3. Members of coordinating boards must be the highest type of citizens who divest themselves of partisan politics.

The statutes creating state boards, in some instances, define membership on the board. Some provide for bipartisan membership or that the board members shall be distributed according to congressional districts. Others say that a board member may not be a resident of a county or district in which a state college or university is located, and, generally, the laws say that the terms of board members shall be of such length and so staggered that under ordinary conditions, a governor cannot pack the board with his own appointees. These provisions and others acknowledge the dangers of partisan political influence. Most serious is a situation in which members of boards feel that it is incumbent on them to resign whenever a new governor, particularly if he represents an opposing political party, comes into office. Whenever

* Italics added by the writer.

politics influence board action, higher education is in jeopardy.

A board of control or a commission on higher education may be entirely free from partisan political considerations but may still be confronted by external political influences. A number of instances could be cited in which governors during the heat of a political campaign have promised that a junior college, a branch of a university, or a degree-granting state college would be located in a community in return for the community's political support. This has been done without reference to state-wide plans. Also, state boards and commissions are not infrequently subjected to pressures by Chambers of Commerce, or citizens' groups to establish institutions or research centers in particular communities without reference to how such an institution or institute fits into a state plan. In such circumstances, the state agency representing the interest of the citizens must protect the state against the intrusion of unneeded institutions or programs into the system of higher education in fulfillment of political promises or in response to political pressures.

4. The state board or commission must maintain consistency and continuity in purposes, policies and functions.

There is the danger that when a board or commission experiences a rapid turnover in membership a loss of perspective and discontinuity in purposes and policies may follow. There is a danger that a board or its equivalent whose membership remains unchanged over a period of time will gradually lose some of its imaginative impetus and will become a protector of the status quo. Rightly or wrongly, a new board member sometimes believes that he has been appointed to be a torch-bearer for a particular cause—economy, technical education, medical education, or space science education. In such a situation, the experienced board members must orient the newcomer to board policies and procedures and help him to view his "cause" in the perspective of the state system of higher education. Among other things, this means that the board must have a well-formulated statement of purposes and policies which are a constant point of reference in its deliberations.

5. The state board or commission must maintain effective liaison with the institutions, the legislature and the public.

The board must have open channels of communication with local boards when they exist. Free discussion with local boards and with the administrative officers of each institution will give a state agency an understanding ot the mission and motivating forces in each situation. Such discussion will also enable the agency to clarify and interpret its actions as they effect the institutions. If the agency is looked upon as a dictatorial body endeavoring to exercise restraints, it will speedily lose its effectiveness.

A special problem in this area is the maintenance of effective liaison with junior colleges when they operate under a separate board. Several plans for this purpose are in effect. In Florida a liaison committee representing the secondary schools, the junior colleges and the degree-granting state institutions has been established. In Mississippi the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning sets criteria for the admission of students from junior colleges to degree-granting institutions even though a separate junior college commission is responsible for the location of new junior colleges and, in general, for their functions and operation. As yet, no clear-cut pattern of coordination of the agencies responsible respectively for junior colleges and degree-granting institutions has emerged.

Of special importance is the maintenance of effective liaison with private institutions. Private colleges and universities perform a public service even though they may not be under public support or control. Planning and coordinating agencies generally accept the private institutions as essential elements in a total plan of higher education, but in too many instances private institutions have little or no part in the process of planning and coordination by a state agency. Moreover, the state planning and coordinating agency should not merely assume the role of "protector" of the interest of private institutions. One of its major concerns should be how to strenghten and improve them for they are indeed a part of a state's total system of higher education. In some states representatives of private colleges and universities are invited to meet with the state agency in an advisory

capacity. As has already been noted, in California the membership of the Coordinating Council actually includes representatives of private higher institutions.

The agency must be forthright in its defense of institutional budget requests before the legislature or of new institutions or programs. It must support its position with reliable convincing data. The public, too, has a vested interest in higher education. It wants to know why the board or commission does not recommend the establishment of a second engineering school even though the pressure for it is strong in a given community; the public wants to know what steps are being taken to bolster the quality of higher education in the state.

These things the public has a right to know and the state board should use every medium at its command to make the information available.

6. The central agency must determine criteria for the establishment of new institutions and programs.

State and national agencies have given much consideration to conditions requisite for the establishment and successful operation of community junior colleges.[1] From the studies and deliberations of these agencies and organizations a number of guidelines have emerged. No corresponding attention has been given to criteria for establishment of four-year colleges. The urgency of this need is emphasized by the number of states in the South confronted with demands for the conversion of junior colleges into degree-granting institutions and for the establishment of new four-year colleges.

The Liaison Committee of the California State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California[19] suggest three factors to be taken into account. It proposes that "2,000 full-time-equivalent of regular students, after five full years of operation (freshman through graduate classes), is a minimum potential that would justify the establishment of a state college." The Committee also suggests that the effect of the establishment of new colleges on existing institutions and the cost of their establishment and operation must be considered in determining need for new institutions.

There is still a great need for more adequate guidelines for the establishment of new degree-granting colleges.

7. The state agency must have a competent staff. The state agency must have an executive officer whose salary and status is comparable to that of a university president. In fact, there are strong arguments for his being designated chancellor of the state system of higher education.

The executive officer must have adequate assistance to perform effectively the multiple functions usually assigned him. His top level assistants should have qualifications and status approximately comparable to those of a university vice president. His office will be responsible for research and data collection relating to (a) budget and fiscal management, (b) program analysis, and (c) physical facilities and space planning. These are basic to planning and coordination. Other areas that will have to be included in staff studies are enrollments and enrollment projections, student retention and attrition, class size, teaching loads, unit costs of instruction, faculty characteristics and faculty turnover, conditions of faculty service, extension programs, etc. The scope of research and special studies will have to be defined and the number of staff members and their qualifications will have to be decided in the light of the services to be performed. A sufficiently experienced and competent staff is essential for a central agency to accomplish its difficult tasks and work effectively with universities, state officials, the legislature and the general public. Table 1 gives an idea of present salaries of state-wide administrative or coordinating agency staffs.

From time to time, situations will arise that the staff cannot deal with competently. In a role and scope study, for example, the allocation of a specialized educational program or the establishment of a new program may present some very difficult and controversial issues. In such instances the staff should rely on consultants for advice and recommendations.

8. The state agency must have adequate financial support.

If the state agency is to perform its multiple functions effectively, it must be given the financial support needed to conduct its operations on a high professional level. Funds are needed to employ a competent staff, to pay consultants,

Table 1

SALARIES OF STATE-WIDE ADMINISTRATIVE OR COORDINATING AGENCY STAFFS IN NINE SOUTHERN STATES, 1963

Position	Number Reported	Maximum Salary	Median Salary	Minimum Salary
Chancellor, Director or Executive Secretary	9	$25,000	$20,000	$14,208
Assistant Director	5	17,500	13,500	9,000
Other Professional and Semi-Professional*	46	17,500	8,750	4,700
Service and Allied	43	6,500	4,000	2,880

* Includes the following types of function: research analyst or coordinator (9), administrative assistant (7), program analyst or auditor (3), fiscal analyst (4), higher education assistant (3), business manager (2), accountant (2), director of testing and guidance (2), supervisor of statistical operations, associate in planning, architect, nursing education consultant, treasurer, assistant for university relations, general auditor, properties supervisor.

November 10, 1965

SALARIES OF STATE-WIDE ADMINISTRATIVE OR COORDINATING AGENCY STAFFS IN TEN SOUTHERN STATES, 1965

(Comparable 1963 figures for nine Southern states appeared on page 42 of State-Wide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education by A. J. Brumbaugh, published by the Southern Regional Education Board)

Position	Number Reported	Maximum Salary	Median Salary	Average Salary	Minimum Salary
Chancellor, Director or Executive Secretary	10	$35[illegible]00	$20,000	$21,409	$15,288
Assistant Director	12	20[illegible]00	15,000	16,241	12,000
Other Professional and Semi-Professional*	62	20[illegible]00	11,529	11,134	4,920
Service and Allied	62	[illegible]00	4,163	4,500	3,000

*Includes the following types of function: Program and Research Officers (18), Budget and Finance Officers (16), Analysts (6), Administrative Assistants (5), Public Relations (3), Directors of Facilities (3), Architects (2), Executive Secretaries (2), Academic Officer, Statistician, Coordinator of Junior Colleges, Director of Testing and Guidance, Nursing Education Consultant, Editor, and Information Specialist.

to cover travel expenses, to provide essential library materials, to pay the cost of publications, and to provide adequate space and equipment. One of the great errors made by some legislatures is to assume that, once established, a planning and coordinating board, or a governing board, can operate on a financial shoestring. A board, no matter how well qualified or how dedicated its members, must have resources that will enable it to operate at a truly high professional level.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Higher education is a subject of great interest and vital importance. Citizens and their representatives in the legislatures demand appropriate opportunities for post-secondary education to be available to every qualified individual; educational programs geared to the social, economic and political needs of the time; the highest possible degree of excellence in educational institutions; economy and efficiency consistent with and contributing to excellence and adequate financial resources to realize these objectives.

The administrators and faculties of higher institutions share these goals but because of their special interests in their respective institutions they sometimes find it difficult to view their institutions in the perspective of a total state-wide system of higher education. Therefore, even though the citizens and the higher institutions have objectives in common, both require an independent agency to plan toward these objectives and to coordinate higher institutions in such a way that the citizens receive maximal educational returns for the state's expenditures. A state planning and coordinating agency will be effective only if it has a forward-looking philosophy, a competent professional staff, and adequate resources to support its operations.

PRECEEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General References:

1. Brumbaugh, A. J. *Guidelines for the Establishment of Community Junior Colleges.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963, 21 pp.
2. Chambers, M.M. *Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1961, 83 pp.
3. The Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South. *Within Our Reach.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1961, 48 pp.
4. Gardner, John W. *Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?* New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1961, 171 pp.
5. Glenny, Lyman A. *Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959, 325 pp.
6. Martorana, S. V. and Hollis, Ernest V. *State Boards Responsible for Higher Education.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960, 254 pp.
7. McConnell, T. R. *A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962, 198 pp.
8. Moos, Malcolm and Rourke, Francis E. *The Campus and the State.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1959, 414 pp.
9. Morrison, D. G. and Martorana, S. V. *State Formulas for*

PRECEEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED

the Support of Public Two-Year Colleges. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, 70 pp.

10. Southern Regional Educational Board. *Statistics for the Sixties: Higher Education in the South.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963, 109 pp.
11. ———————— *Summary of State Legislation Affecting Higher Education in the South,* 1961 and 1962. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1961 and 1962, 32 and 49 pp.
12. U.S. Office of Education. *Higher Education* [Education Directory, 1962-63: Part 3]. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963, 221 pp.
13. ———————— *State Directors of Junior Colleges and Coordinators of State Systems of Two-Year Colleges: Conference Proceedings, October 18 and 19, 1961.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, 53 pp.

Reports of State Studies:

14. Brumbaugh, A. J. and Blee, Myron R. *Recommendations and General Staff Report* [Higher Education and Florida's Future, Volume 1]. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1956, 87 pp.
15. Coffelt, John J. *Self-Study of Higher Education in Oklahoma.* Oklahoma City: Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, January, 1962, (in several parts).
16. Coordinating Council for Higher Education. *Scope, Functions, and Procedures for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.* Sacramento and San Francisco: Coordinating Council for Higher Education, May 1962, 23 pp.
17. Foushee, Roger B. *Fact Book on Higher Education in North Carolina.* Raleigh: The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School, August, 1962, 54 pp.
18. The Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School. *The Report of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond the High School, North Carolina, 1962.* Raleigh: The Governor's

Commission on Education Beyond the High School, 1962, 133 pp.

19. Joint Staff of the Liaison Committee. *A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California.* Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1957, 172 pp.

20. Martorana, S. V. *Needs, Policies, and Plans for 2-Year Colleges in Virginia.* Richmond: Virginia State Council of Higher Education, December, 1959, 101 pp.

21. Master Plan Survey Team. *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975.* Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960, 230 pp.

22. McConnell, Thomas R. *A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education.* Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1955, 473 pp.

23. Russell, John Dale. *The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan.* Lansing: Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, March, 1958, (in several parts).

24. State Council of Higher Education of Virginia and the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce. *Higher Education in the Tidewater Area of Virginia.* Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, September, 1959, 211 pp.

25. Virginia Advisory Legislative Council. *Higher Education in Virginia, Report to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia.* Richmond: Commonwealth of Virginia Division of Purchase and Printing, 1951, 89 pp.

Reports by State Councils or Boards:

26. Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning. *Biennial Report of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning.* Jackson, Mississippi: Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning, biennial—latest 1959-1961.

27. Florida Board of Control of Institutions of Higher Learning. *Report to the Governor.* Tallahassee: Florida Board of Control of Institutions of Higher Learning, biennial—latest 1960-62.

28. Governor's Advisory Committee on Higher Education. *Report of Governor's Advisory Committee on Higher Education.* Columbia, South Carolina: Governor's Advisory Committee on Higher Education, March 6, 1962, 72 pp.

29. Liaison Committe on Higher Education in Minnesota. *Report for 1961-63.* St. Paul: Liaison Committee on Higher Education, 16 pp.

30. North Carolina Board of Higher Education. *Biennial Report.* Raleigh: North Carolina Board of Higher Education, biennial—latest 1961-1963.

31. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. *Biennial Report.* Oklahoma City: Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, biennial--latest 1960-1962.

32. State Council of Higher Education. *Biennial Report of the State Council of Higher Education to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia.* Richmond: State Council of Higher Education, biennial —latest September, 1961.

33. Texas Commision on Higher Education. *Report to the Honorable Price Daniel, Governor of Texas and the Legislature of the State of Texas.* Austin: Texas Commission on Higher Education, annual—latest December 31, 1962.

34. University System of Georgia. *Annual Report.* Atlanta: University System of Georgia, annual--latest fiscal year 1961-62.